



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/711,930	11/15/2000	Hwa-Chun Lin	EM/LIN/6195	8542	
75	90 07/01/2004		EXAMINER		
Bacon & Thon	Bacon & Thomas PLLC			AFSHAR, KAMRAN	
625 Slaters Land	e			D. DED 1411 (DED	
4th Floor			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Alexandria, VA	, VA 22314-1176 2681			6	
		DATE MAILED: 07/01/2		1	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
· Advisory Action	09/711,930	LIN ET AL.			
	Examiner //	Art Unit			
	Kamran Afshar, 703-305-7373	2681			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence addi	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 16 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appears Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this application to the same of th	cation. A proper rep ch places the applic	oly to a cation in		
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later th ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	risory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. S	ee MPEP		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The da have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moteraned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate ext the final Office action; or	ension fee under (2) as set forth in		
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF 					
2. \square The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:				
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);			
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or s	implifying the		
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ns.		
NOTE:					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	l be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed	d amendment		
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does NC	OT place the		
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	re newly		
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: \-(\psi\)					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	·			
10. Other:					
		Kamran Afshar, 70 Patent Examiner Art Unit: 2681	03-305-7373		

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments filed 6/16/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the invention determines the double thresholds by selecting the cluster level threshold and the cell level threshold are selected in such a manner that combinations of the cluster and cell level thresholds that can guarantee a predetermined call hand-off dropping probability under any load condition are first found, and then, a particular combination of cluster and cell level thresholds that results in a maximum throughput of the network among the combinations which satisfy a bound on call hand off dropping probability is found) are not recited in independent rejected claim 1 (See e.g. Page 4, Lines 17-22). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. Therefore, the previous rejection is maintained. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993)...

BATEN' EXAMINER